REMARKS

In the Amendment filed May 14, 2007, allowable claim 61 was rewritten in independent form to place it, and the claims dependent thereon, in condition for allowance. Moreover, the feature of claim 61 was incorporated into the other rejected independent claims, which was believed to place those claims in condition for allowance as well.

The present RCE is being filed to obtain entry of the May 14, 2007 Amendment, and to obtain consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed concurrently herewith. The Information Disclosure Statement cites U.S. Patent 6,115,698 (Tuck et al.), which was cited by Examiner Jocelyn Greimel of Group Art Unit 3693, in related co-pending Application No. 09/927,868 ("the '868 application"), filed August 10, 2001, which claims benefit to the same parent applications as the present application.

In the Office Action dated August 1, 2007 in the '868 application, Examiner Greimel cited the Tuck et al. patent in rejecting, inter alia, independent claim 1 (the only independent claim) of the '868 application, which reads:

> 1. A process for notifying a maker in a computerized trading system that his offer is subject to being accepted by another trader using the trading system, the process comprising:
>
> determining when a predetermined percentage of traders are permitted to accept the makers quote, the predetermined percentage being more than one and less than all of the traders with which the maker has bilateral credit; and
>
> informing the maker that his offer can be accepted by the predetermined percentage of traders.

The position was taken in the Office Action that Tuck, at col. 4, lines 40-64; col. 7, lines 14-41; col. 8, lines 1-67 and col. 9, lines 1-57, disclosed the recited features of claim 1.

In the response to the August 1, 2007 Office Action that was filed on January 30, 2007 in the '868 application, the Applicant pointed out that Tuck's teaching, at col. 9, lines 8-15, of showing the number of viewers for which a feasible contract path exists for a transaction, is not the same as

the recited informing of the maker that his offer can be accepted by a predetermined percentage of traders.

In the most recent Office Action in the '868 application, mailed May 4, 2007, Examiner Greimel has withdrawn the rejection based on the Tuck reference. In the May 4, 2007 Action, no prior art was applied against the claims of the '868 application. It is requested that the Examiner of the present application consider the Tuck et al. reference, and also review the Office Actions and response filed in the '868 application, discussed above.

Applicant also wishes to clarify the argument presented (in the present application) in the Response to Non-Final Office Action dated July 12, 2006, at the last two paragraphs of page 3 and carrying over to the first paragraph of page 4 of the Response. In that portion of the arguments, Applicant was distinguishing the percentage discussed at col. 8, lines 10-18 of Lupien, from the percentage as that term is used in the independent claims that recite providing an indication of a percentage of counterparties that can accept at least a portion of the quote.

Of course, as was pointed out at the second paragraph at page 3 of the July 12, 2006 Response, other independent claims are pending that are *not* limited to an indication of a percentage. For example, independent claims 61 and 37 recite providing an indication to the first trading entity that at least a portion of its quote can be accepted by a predetermined number which is more than one but less than all of the first trading entity's trading counterparties. The argument discussed in the foregoing paragraph was not intended to limit in any way independent claims 61 (or its predecessor base claim 9) and 37 to an indication of a percentage.

In view of the foregoing, and the Amendment in Response to Final Office Action filed May 14, 2007, applicant requests an early and favorable action on the merits.

Dated: May 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant